

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 12 were pending in this application.

Claims 1 – 12 were rejected.

Claims 1, 8 and 11 are amended.

Claim 6 was cancelled.

### **L.35 USC 112 Rejections**

**The Examiner has objected to the wording of Claims 11 and 12 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.**

The present invention is a system and method that is used to isolate a computer from a computer network in a manner that prevents hackers on the computer network from accessing that computer. The present invention works by placing a computer controlled switch between the computer and the computer network. The switch is kept open in default, thereby physically disconnecting the computer from the computer network.

When the computer generates a data transmission addressed to a location on the computer network, the switch automatically closes to allow the transmission to pass to the computer network. Once the data transmission is made, the switch again opens.

If the data transmission contains a request for return data, the switch will automatically open to allow for the receipt of the return data. As soon as the return data is received, the switch again isolates the computer.

The Examiner has rejected the wording of Claim 11 under 35 USC 112 stating that the specification does not disclose how ***“the computer is automatically connected to a network by sending a transmission and later automatically disconnected from the network once responding request data is received”***. (See Office Action, Examiner’s comments, top of Page 4).

The applicant discloses that the switch is controlled by the protocol language of the transmissions. However, the Examiner states the applicant ***“neither discloses a well-known***

*protocol that could be used for this purpose nor disclose any detail of a suitable protocol.”*

The Applicant's disclosure is fully enabling to a person skilled in the art, as is explained below.

The present invention can be applied to many computer networks. The Examiner will understand that different computer networks use different computer languages and therefore use different software protocols. Therefore, there is no one protocol that fits all applications. However, the protocols for that computer network are well known to the programmers of that network. Accordingly, the protocols that begin and end any transmission would be well known.

By way of example, consider a computer attempting to access information contained on a website using the Internet. This example is used, because it is one of the most common applications of a computer communicating with an outside network.

Without having to explain all details of how the Internet works, here it is in a nutshell.

Most all protocols used by computer networks are specified in Request For Comment (RFC) documents that are publicly known. An archive of available RFC protocol types are available at <http://sunsite.auc.dk/RFC/>.

One of the most commonly used protocols is Hypertext Transfer Protocols (HTTP). Every web server on the Internet conforms to HTTP protocols. One of the most common commands in HTTP is “**GET filename**” command protocol.

An expert in the field would understand that if a person were on a personal computer and were trying to access the PTO website ([www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)) via the internet, the personal computer would transmit the following line of code in HTTP

**-- GET <http://www.uspto.gov>.--**

Once that line of http protocol is transmitted, the server of the PTO website responds by transmitting the contents of the website requested. Please see “How Web Servers Work” as provided as Attachment A to this response.

Once a “*Get Filename*” command is received by a server, the server downloads the contents of the requested website. The website is written in Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML). As will be understood by an expert in the field, all website files begin with the HTML tag *<HTML>*. That is, in the programming language of the website, the first line of the programming language is *<HTML>*. All website files end with the HTML tag *</HTML>*. That is, the last line of the file is *</HTML>*. See How Web Pages Work” as provided as Attachment B to this response.

It will therefore be understood, a computer can detect when a website file has begun downloading by detecting the *<HTML>* tag. A computer can detect when a website file has finished downloading by detecting the *</HTML>* tag.

In the present application, the claimed switch remains open until the claimed computer sets forth a request of data from the outside network. This can be simply accomplished by detecting the occurrence of a “*Get Filename*” protocol in the Hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP) language.

The computer can detect when a website file has begun downloading by detecting the *<HTML>* line of code which appears at the beginning of the download. The computer can detect the end of a download by detecting the *</HTML>* line of code at the end of the download.

The Examiner should therefore understand that using the computer languages of a computer network, the beginning and ending of computer requests and file downloads are easily achieved by detecting the programming code that corresponds to these elements. The Applicants specification is therefore believed to be fully enabling to any person who is skilled in the programming language of a computer network.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the Examiner’s 35 USC 112 rejection be withdrawn.

## **II. ALLOWABLE MATTER**

The Examiner has indicated that the matter of Claim 11 and Claim 12 is distinguishable over the cited prior art. In view of the above comments, it is believed that the 35 USC 112 rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 11 and 12 are therefore believed to stand in condition for allowance.

The matter of Claims 8-10 have been amended to depend from Claim 11. Since Claims 8-10 now depend from Claim 11, Claims 8-10 are believed to stand in condition for allowance.

## **III. 35 USC 102(b) Rejections**

**The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 - 7 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,202,153 to Diamant.**

### Claim 1

The Examiner has indicated that the prior art does not disclose or suggest “*a mechanism by which a network connection switch could be actuated automatically based upon a received data flow that responds to a sent request rather than by outside intervention*”.

Claim 1 has been amended in view of the Examiner's remarks. Claim 1 sets forth a method where a switch is placed between the computer and the computer network. The switch automatically closes when the computer generates an initial data transmission addressed to a location on the computer network. The switch automatically returns to its default open condition upon the conclusion of the data transmission.

Since the claimed methodology sets forth a switch that is automatically activated upon a received data flow, by the Examiner's own admission, this matter is not disclosed by the Diamant patent.. Consequently, the Diamant patent does not disclose the matter contained in Claim 1. It is therefore requested that the 35 USC 103 rejection as applied to Claim 1 and its dependent claims be withdrawn.

#### **IV. 35 USC 103 Rejections**

**Claims 8-10 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,202,153 to Diamant in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,202,997 to Arato.**

Claim 8-10 have been amended to depend from Claim 11. The Examiner has already indicated that the matter of Claim 11 is distinguishable over the cited prior art.

Claims 8-10 are therefore believed to be allowable since they depend from, and further define, an allowable base claim.

#### **V. Corrected Oath**

A corrected oath is provided in view of the Examiner remarks.

#### **VI. SUMMARY**

Having fully distinguished the pending claims over the cited art, this application is believed to stand in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is requested to call the applicant's attorney at (215) 321-6772 in order that any outstanding issues may be resolved without the necessity of issuing a further Office Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Eric A. LaMorte  
Reg. No. 34,653  
Attorney For Applicant